



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,832	10/24/2003	Kenneth E. Kadziauskas	3113	9263
33357 7590 07/16/2008 ADVANCED MEDICAL OPTICS, INC. 1700 E. ST. ANDREW PLACE SANTA ANA, CA 92705				
EXAMINER STIGELL, THEODORE J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3763				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,832

Applicant(s)

KADZIAUSKAS ET AL.

Examiner

THEODORE J. STIGELL

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3.5, 23 and 29-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3.5, 23 and 29-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/20/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 3, 5, 23, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Armeniades et al. (4,841,984). Armeniades discloses a method of controlling fluid flow to and from an eye during ophthalmic surgery comprising the steps of introducing irrigation fluid into an eye via a bi-directional positive displacement pump (107,122,140) and determining the initial irrigation fluid pressure (see column 6, lines 28-32), adjusting the maximum vacuum setting based on the initial irrigation fluid pressure, continuously determining the irrigation fluid pressure after the initial

determination, and continuously adjusting the maximum vacuum setting based on the continuous determination of the irrigation fluid pressure.

In regards to the dependent claims, Armeniades discloses a method that includes all of the limitations as recited in claim 3 wherein the step of initially determining irrigation fluid pressure includes determining the in-line pressure of irrigation line and further comprising using a change in irrigation pressure to provide an indication of wound leaking (the intraocular pressure sensor would detect the leak as a pressure change).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3, 5, 23, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armeniades et al. (4,548,205) in view of Armeniades et al.

Art Unit: 3763

(4,841,984). Armeniades ('205) discloses most of the limitations recited in the claims listed above, but fails to teach introducing irrigation fluid via a positive displacement pump. Armeniades ('984) teaches that using pumps to deliver irrigation fluid is useful in controlling the irrigation fluid pressure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Armeniades ('205) with the pump of Armeniades ('984) to provide a system capable of controlling irrigation fluid pressure which is a desirable capability in ophthalmic surgery.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 3, 5, 29-30, and 32-33 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 and 5 of US Patent No. 7,018,355. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

patentably distinct from each other because the step of "adjusting maximum vacuum setting" is substantially the same step as "adjusting aspiration fluid flow".

Claims 3, 5, 23, and 29-34 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,899,694. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the steps recited in the patent and not in the instant application are obvious steps of phacoemulsification.

Claims 3, 5, 23, and 29-34 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 7,001,356. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the steps recited in the patent and not in the instant application are obvious steps of phacoemulsification.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/20/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that Armeniades (4,841,984) does not disclose a bi-directional positive displacement pump, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Armeniades discloses peristaltic pumps which one of ordinary skill in the art would understand are capable of pumping fluids in either direction. The examiner references US 5,954,971 to Pages et al. to support the statement that peristaltic pumps are known to be bi-directional.

The disclaimer filed on 6/20/2008 was not accepted and therefore the double patenting rejections still remain in effect. An attorney of record must sign the terminal disclaimer to fulfill the requirements of 3.73(b) to make the terminal disclaimer valid. An empowerment statement must be included to show that the signed attorney is an attorney of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THEODORE J. STIGELL whose telephone number is (571)272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3763

/Theodore J Stigell/
Examiner, Art Unit 3763

/Nicholas D Lucchesi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763